R E M A R K S

Entry of this Amendment and reconsideration of this application as amended are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-22, 34-43 and 44 are pending in this application. Claims 23-32 and 45 are cancelled. Claims 5, 15 and 33 are withdrawn from consideration in view of the earlier election of species requirement.

Claims 1 and 13 are amended to include the subject matter of claim 45 as previously set forth. No new matter is therefore introduced by the changes to claims 1 and 13. Unless an argument is made below in support of the patentability of each of these claims over the cited prior art, the changes to these claims do not relate to patentability.

Election/Restriction

Claims 5, 15 and 33 are withdrawn from consideration in view of the earlier election of species requirement. It is respectfully requested that these claims be re-joined with the elected claims if claims 1 and 13 are found to be allowable in a form generic to the embodiment set forth in these claim.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-4, 6-13, 16-22 and 34-45 were rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takami et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,402,688) in view of Crane (U.S. Pat. No. 464,692).

The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed in view of changes to independent claims 1 and 13.

Claims 1 and 13 are amended to recite that the body is monolithic. A common definition of monolithic is "consisting of one piece, solid or unbroken". As described in the specification, the body in various forms can be molded in one piece (see page 4, lines 7-9). A significant advantage of the monolithic or one-piece construction of the body in the air introduction device in accordance with the invention is that it allows for a method of manufacture of the body which is considerably less expensive than manufacturing air introduction devices which are capable of performing the same functions.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, Takami et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest a monolithic body.

The Examiner states that Crane shows an air introduction device in which the body is monolithic as allegedly best seen in Fig. 1. However, in Crane, the body of the air introduction device, including an expanded portion having the features set forth in claims 1 and 13, is not monolithic because it is formed from more than one piece. Specifically, the air introduction device includes a conical enlargement "a" which is threaded with

a tip "B". Moreover, it is essential that the "body" of the air introduction device of Crane is formed from the two parts removably connected together via threads because the tip "B" must be removed from engagement with the conical enlargement "a" prior to use to enable placement of capsules H therein (see page 2, lines 16-20). Thus, not only does Crane not disclose a monolithic body including an expanded portion but it also cannot teach or suggest such a monolithic body.

Since Takami et al. and Crane do not disclose all of the features of claims 1 and 13, they cannot be combined to render obvious the embodiments of the invention set forth in these claims or in claims 2-4, 6-12, 14, 16-22 and 33-44 which depend directly or indirectly upon claim 1 or claim 13.

Moreover, Takami et al. and Crane do not disclose, teach or suggest all of the features of the dependent claims.

For example, Takami et al. does not disclose that a distal portion of a monolithic body has two arms, each having a lumen defining an opening and one of which has a central axis parallel to a common central axis of a proximal portion and an expanded portion of the body as set forth in claim 8. The Examiner referred to Fig. 1 of Takami et al. but the only arm with a lumen in Takami et al. is the forceps-inlet 17 which clearly does not have a central axis parallel to a central axis of the forceps-

outlet 19.

Takami et al. does not disclose a pressure relief valve arranged in a second lumen in a distal portion of a monolithic body for releasing air when a specific air pressure in the rectum is reached as set forth in claim 19. The Examiner referred to pressure regulating and relief valve 38 which is situated inside the air delivery unit 15 and is obviously not situated in a lumen of a distal portion of a single member body.

Crane also does not disclose, teach or suggest the features of claims 8 and 19.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-22 and 33-44 has been overcome and should be removed and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

An early and favorable action on the merits of the invention is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Brian Roffe /

Attorney for Applicant
Brian Roffe
Reg. No. 35,336

Brian Roffe
11 Sunrise Plaza, Suite 303
Valley Stream, New York 11580-6111
Tel. No. (516) 256-5636
Fax No. (516) 256-5638